

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 remain pending in the application.

Suggested Restriction

Applicants respectfully suggest a Restriction Requirement for pending claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120. In particular, Applicants suggest a Group I that would be comprised of claims 1-15 and 58-73, Group II that would be comprised of claims 33-46, and Group III would be comprised of claims 106-120. If accepted, Applicants would respectfully elect Group II.

35 USC 101 Rejection of Claims 58-73

The Examiner rejected claims 58-73 under 35 USC 101 as allegedly being directed toward non-statutory subject matter because of their recitation of a "computer readable medium".

35 USC 101 reads:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

35 USC 101 provides for whoever invents a new and useful "manufacture" may obtain a patent therefor. Applicants' "computer readable medium" becomes a new and useful "manufacture" once comprising the recited instructions. Thus, Applicants are claiming a unique "computer readable medium" because it is comprised of new and useful instructions.

The Examiner's statement that such a recitation is inconsistent with the 30,025+ patents that contain such a phrase within the their claims. The Examiner's allegation is inconsistent with the PTO's patentability policy in place as recently as October 16, 2007.

Moreover, the Examiner provides no support for the allegation that claims 58-73 are directed toward non-statutory subject matter. If the Examiner continues to allege that a "computer readable medium" is non-statutory subject

matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide support for such an allegation.

Claims 58-73 are directed toward statutory subject matter. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 58-73 under 35 USC 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 & 109-120 over Greer and in view of Holland

In the Office Action, claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 to Greer et al. ("Greer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,867 to Holland et al. ("Holland"), with claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71, 73, 112, 116 and 120 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Greer in view of Holland, and further in view of Official Notice; and claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Greer in view of Holland, and further in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0087416 to Knutson ("Knutson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-15 and 58-73 recite forwarding a user request from a **proxy server** to an origin web server, receiving **at the proxy server** a web page from the origin web server, and site-mining **at the proxy server** desired content from the web page. Claims 33-46 recite a **proxy server** that receives a user request for a web page, forwards the request to an origin web server, receives a requested web page having a first format from the origin web server, and site-mines and reformats at least a portion of the content from the web page having the first format, for transmission to the at least one mobile transmission device, in accordance with a limitation associated with the mobile device the content is viewable on. Claims 109-120 recite site-mining a subset of content requested by a mobile device **from a proxy server**, and converting the site-mined subset of content based on mobile device related information **from the proxy server**.

Thus, claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120 recite a **proxy server** that receives content from an origin web server, and site-mining being performed **at/from the proxy server** on the content from an origin web server.

The Examiner acknowledged that “[A]aa does not specifically teach site-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page.” (see Office Action, page 3). The Examiner alleged that “bbb on the other hand teaches cite-mining at the proxy server desired content from the web page [col. 11, lines 35-64].” (see Office Action, page 3). The Applicants are responding hereto to the Examiner rejection of Greer in view of Holland. The Applicants assume the Examiner intended “aaa” to be Greer and “bbb” to be Holland. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s interpretation of Holland.

Holland at col. 11, lines 35-64 teaches use of a “bundling Web server 440 to signal these components [either or both of a data miner and walk-the-Web-site] to generate a bundling descriptor dynamically. These components may also be used to augment the bundle descriptor retrieved at 404 by searching for additional pages that should be added dynamically to the predefined bundle content. The bundle descriptor that results from using these components is used to retrieve each identified page or file. The bundling Web server 440 then packages the files into a bundle, and returns 407 the bundle to the client proxy 460.”

Holland discloses a bundling Web server 440 that sits between a workstation 470 and a page repository 410 (see Fig. 4A). The bundling Web server 440 is used to formulate a bundle descriptor through either or both of a data miner and walk-the-Web-site techniques. Holland’s bundling descriptor is used to retrieve each identified page or file, each identified page or file being packaged into a bundle for return to a workstation proxy 460. Thus, Holland teaching use of data miner and walk-the-Web-site techniques to **formulate a bundle descriptor** before any information is retrieved form a web server, the bundle descriptor being used **to retrieve** an identified therein Web page. Holland fails to disclose, teach or suggest site-mining on content **received from an origin web server**, much less a **proxy server** that receives a content from an origin web server, with site-mining being performed **at/from the proxy server on the content from an origin web server**, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120.

Greer in view of Holland, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest a **proxy server** that receives content from an origin web server, and site-mining being performed **at/from the proxy server** on the content from an origin web server, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120.

Moreover, Claims 33-46 recite a **proxy server** that receives a user request for a web page, forwards the request to an origin web server, receives a requested web page having a first format from the origin web server, and site-mines and **reformats** at least a portion of the content from the web page having the first format, for transmission to the at least one mobile transmission device, in accordance with at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system associated with the mobile device the content is viewable with. Claims 106-108 recite reformatting site-mined web page content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the web page site-mined desired content is viewable on, the limitation comprising at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system provided by said mobile device. Claims 109-120 recite site-mining a subset of content requested by a mobile device from a proxy server, and **converting**, from the **proxy server**, a site-mined subset of content based on at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system provided to the proxy server from the mobile device.

Thus, claims 33-46 and 106-120 recite reformatting or converting site-mined information in accordance with at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system associated with a mobile device.

The Examiner alleged that Greer teaches conversion of content based on client device related information provided to a proxy server, the client device information comprising at least one of a content viewer and operating system at col. 8, lines 5-8 and 22-25; col. 7, lines 13-19; and col. 9, lines 24-26 (see Office Action, page 6). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Greer teaches "the mobile computing device informs the proxy server as to which character set should be used when communicating with that particular mobile computing device (the client character set)." Thus, Greer

teaches a proxy server customizing communications with a mobile communication device, the customized communications being based on a character set specified by the mobile computing device **NOT** in accordance with at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system associated with a mobile device, as recited by claims 33-46 and 106-120.


Greer in view of Holland, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest reformatting or converting site-mined information in accordance with at least one of a type of content viewer and a type of operating system associated with a mobile device, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120.

For these and other reasons, claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df